REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated August 9, 2006. The only claim change herein is that non-elected claims 1-26 have been canceled without prejudice in view of the Restriction Requirement dated July 14, 2006. Thus, claims 27-30 are now pending. Because pending claims 27-30 have not been changed herein, this amendment should be entered given that no new issues have been raised.

Claim 27 stands rejected under Section 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Velke (US 5,810,371). This Section 102(b) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 27 requires "a latch assembly for coupling a protruding member of the sulky to a *spring-biased latch* of the latch assembly when the sulky is folded up from a deployed position to a stowed position so that the latch assembly of the mower can hold the folded-up sulky in the stowed position; wherein the protruding member extends outwardly from a body of the sulky so that at least a distal end of the protruding member defines an angle θ of from about 30 to 70 degrees with the vertical pivot axis of the sulky; and wherein the protruding member of the sulky is *directly coupled to the <u>spring-biased latch</u> when the sulky is folded up in a stowed position, but the protruding member of the sulky is not directly coupled to the spring-biased latch when the sulky is in a deployed position during normal sulky operation when the sulky is trailing behind the mower." For purposes of example and without limitation, Figs. 2-3 illustrate that the protruding member (e.g., 87) of the sulky is directly coupled to the spring-biased latch (e.g., 81) when the sulky is folded up in a stowed position, and Fig. 1 illustrates that the protruding member (e.g., 87) of the sulky is not directly coupled to the spring-biased latch (e.g., 81) when the sulky is in a deployed position during normal sulky operation when the sulky is trailing*

VELKE et al. Appl. No. 10/712,261

January 8, 2007 •

behind the mower. Example non-limiting latch 81 is "spring-biased" because it is biased by at

least one spring (e.g., see spring 83; and paragraph [0034] of the instant specification).

Velke fails to disclose or suggest the "spring-biased latch" called for by claim 27. The

mere presence of a chain link 63 dangling from the dashboard area of the mower in Fig. 12 of

Velke cannot possibly be considered a "spring-biased latch" as required by claim 27. Velke's

dangling chain link 63 is entirely unrelated to the spring-biased latch and latch assembly required

by claim 27. Claim 27 defines over the cited art.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition

for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone

the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

Joseph A. Rhoa Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

- 5 -